



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARK
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
--------------------	-------------	-----------------------	---------------------

09/602,440

06/23/2000

WILFRIED FISCHER 2727-110

EXAMINER

H. SHEIKH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1615

DATE MAILED:

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) HUMERA N. SHEIKH (3)

(2) SAMUEL Megaditchian (4)

Date of Interview 16 December 2003

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Televideo Conference ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-10 (of record)

Identification of prior art discussed: Hoffman (US 5,538,736)

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Differences between instant application & Hoffman et al. were discussed. Applicant argued that prior art actually "teaches away" from instant claims since Hoffman requires at least two reservoirs (preferably 3); whereas instant invention requires only one reservoir wherein the active agent is contained within the CORE ONLY (and Not the PINN). *

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary. A FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.

* Examiner Sheikh suggested to show some unexpected results obtained from the instant invention & also suggested to amend claim language. Examiner pointed out that instant claim 1, which partly recites "adhesive is rendered transparent" is a future intended property, which would not distinguish over the cited art. Applicant ~~agreed~~ may amend claim language & will argue the teaching away from Hoffman in his response.